List of Attending Members

Albanese-O'neill,

Anastasia Southwest Airlines

Bates, Ron, Mayor, City of Los Alamitos

Bernson, Hal, Councilmember, City of Los Angeles

Bishop, Richard Western Riverside Council of Governments (videoconference)

Bliss, Herman Federal Aviation Administration

Burkhart, Dan National Business Aviation Association

Butler, Viggo United Airports Limited

De La Loza, James Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

De Young, Cathryn, Councilmember, City of Laguna Niguel Dispenza, Mike Councilmember, City of Palmdale

Dixon, Richard, Mayor, City of Lake Forest

Galanter, Ruth Councilmember, City of Los Angeles

Gordon, Mike, Mayor, City of El Segundo

Griffith, Barry Palm Springs International Airport

Hamm, Bob County of Imperial (for Supervisor Hank Kuiper)
Hammer, Russell Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce

Harrison, T. Milford San Bernardino International Airport

Lloyd, Stephen Federal Aviation Administration, Air Traffic Division Mikels, Jon, Supervisor, County of San Bernardino (by telephone)

Mikels, Judy, Supervisor, County of Ventura (Chair)
Miscikow ski, Cindy, Councilmember, City of Los Angeles

Murphy, Alan, Director, John Wayne Airport
Murphy, Stacey, Councilmember, City of Burbank
Nestande, Bruce, Los Angeles Business Advisors
O'Connor, Pam, Councilmember, City of Santa Monica

Ovitt, Gary, Mayor, City of Ontario Proo, Beatrice, Mayor, City of Pico Rivera

Propst, Rod, Chair, Aviation Technical Advisory Committee

Ridgew ay, Tod Mayor, City of New port Beach

Ritchie, Jim, Deputy Executive Director, Los Angeles World Airports

Rizzo, Philip, Executive Director, March Inland Port

Roberts, Ron Mayor, City of Temecula

Rodine, Robert, Valley Industry Commerce Association Smith, Scott, Ventura County Department of Airports

Soderquist, Peter, Airport Manager, Southern California Logistics Airport

Stanford, Dick, Mayor, City of Azusa

Stein, Ted Los Angeles City Airport Commission (vice chair)
Streator, Joyce Burbank Glendale Pasadena Airport Authority
Thomas, Sheryl Los Angeles World Airports, Government Affairs

List of Absent Members

Adams, Frank Federal Express

Antonovich, Mike Supervisor, County of Los Angeles

Bagley, Jim City of 29 Palms

Barrie, Terry California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics

Cox, Richard Air Transport Association

Davis, Bill Ventura County Transportation Commission

Dunlap, Judy
Councilmember, City of Inglew ood
Fox, Guy
Los Angeles Air Cargo Association
Knabe, Don
Supervisor, County of Los Angeles

Kunze, Chris Long Beach Airport

Kyser, Jack Los Angeles Economic Development Corporation

MacRae, Bruce United Parcel Service

Perry, Bev City of Brea

Russell, Jon Airline Pilots Association Schatz, Carol Central City Association Smith, Charles Supervisor, County of Orange

Thomas, Sheryl Los Angeles World Airport, Government Affairs.

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The October 23, 2002 meeting of the Aviation Task Force was called to order at 10:07 a.m. by Chairperson Judy Mikels, Supervisor, Ventura County.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Public Speakers

Shirley Conger Orange County Airport Working Group
Tom Naughton Orange County Airport Working Group

Charles Griffin New port Beach
Cecil Carpio City of Inglew ood
Carole Hossan City of Los Angeles

Shirley Conger, Orange County Airport Working Group, wanted to discuss the \$1.5 million grant, which stipulates the exclusion of El Toro for new planning. The exclusion of El Toro is the result of a local land use decision in Orange County that impacts the entire southern California area. If the same rules had applied to the railroads in the 19th century, none could have been built. In the 1950s, President Eisenhow er instituted the National Highw ay System. With the existing zoning laws applied, the highway system could not have been built. Local control of freeway routes could have stopped highway production. Ms. Conger noted the increased production out of China and noted that that the USA needs facilities to compete with this growing economic engine. El Toro is a natural resource that should not be throw naway.

Tom Naughton, Orange County Airport Working Group, noted an article in the LA Times concerning safety at an El Toro Airport. Mr. Naughton emphasized that the El Toro that runw ays 7 and 34 can handle commercial aircraft today.

Charles Griffin, New port Beach, objected to the FAA grant excluding an El Toro airport. Mr. Griffin indicated various flight tracks that show communities of Tustin, Costa Mesa, New port Beach, Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach and Seal Beach are bearing the impact of increased airspace utilization in Orange County. Long Beach airport activity is expected to increase, already tripling this year alone. Long Beach is artificially constrained. El Toro could be used tomorrow.

Cecil Carpio, City of Inglew ood objected to only one public comment period for the meeting, stating there should be one at the end of the meeting so anything brought up during the meeting could be addressed by the public as well.

Carole Hossan, Community of Westchester (within the City of Los Angeles) discussed the Southern California Regional Airport Authority. The Authority was

hoped to spread the wealth and misery of air traffic growth. The City of LA stopped attending which tied the Authority's hands. The Authority was a good idea whose time has not apparently come. It may need to be re-organized where it can focus on plans that could be accomplished without Los Angeles. This is a sad commentary on LA. Ms. Hossan also objected to a MagLev line that went to LAX, stating it should go elsewhere. Ms. Hossan also objected to the LAX alternative, stating it is not capacity neutral.

3.0 ROUTINE ITEMS

3.1 <u>September 25 Meeting Minutes</u>

Hon. Gary Ovitt, Mayor, City of Ontario noted that on Page 16 of the minutes, he was incorrectly listed as the Mayor of San Bernardino.

James De La Loza, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, noted his first name was missing from the list of attendees.

Motion was made to approve minutes with corrections and was seconded.

3.2 Members Phone List

Chair Mikels requested all participants to review the membership listing and notify SCAG staff of any discrepancies in contact information. Chair Mikels stressed that each member provide the most consistent address, telephone number, e-mail address or fax number in order to receive timely information.

4.0 <u>INFORMATION ITEMS</u>

4.1 Los Angeles World Airports Update

The Presentation was tabled until the December/January timeframe. Chair Mikels requested that MagLev (Agenda Item 5.2) be discussed next because of schedule constraints.

5.0 ACTION ITEMS

5.1 Aviation Program and WorkPlan

Item w as postponed until after Agenda Item 5.2.

Mr. Rich Macias, Manager, Aviation and Environmental Planning, SCAG, reviewed the Aviation Task Force charges. The Task Force was not to re-invent the wheel but to use existing information to update the plan with necessary adjustments.

These adjustments were to take into account current economic trends, the impacts after the 9-11 terrorist attack and the grant restrictions disallowing El Toro for new planning.

SCAG needs to seek input from each county, in terms of determining what each county thinks its aviation demand is and how it plans to meet that demand. Staff has prepared letters to that effect and were mailing them to the relevant parties that day.

One of the key projects is to develop an implementation strategy for the plan, at least in terms of designing the parameters for implementation.

SCAG will perform a capacity analysis for each airport, update the assumptions used in the last plan. Those assumptions will be brought to the task force for its approval. SCAG will update the forecasts in five-year increments up to 2030 to be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) analysis and apply performance standards as detailed in page 32 or 33 of the agenda packet.

SCAG will perform an airspace analysis to ultimately test the plan as ultimately approved by the task force. There will be an extensive regional ground access strategy that will be a major portion of the Regional Transportation Plan. The RTP staff will update the task force on the ground access workplan at the next month. There will be a financial strategy as to how to implement the plan, examining existing funding mechanisms and determining what mechanisms need to be created. There will also be a management strategy to determine what entity needs to be responsible for plan implementation as well as the legal administrative framew ork.

The Aviation Program is fully funded through the Federal Aviation Administration. The grant is designed to fund the program to design and implement the plan. There is a restriction that none of the grant funds can be used to promote or plan an airport facility at El Toro.

Taking that factor and the charges given at the last meeting, SCAG looked at w hat w as available as a starting point. Mr. Macias emphasized that w hat w as needed at this point is w hether this is the appropriate course of action to take as a starting point. Of the thirteen scenarios that w ere discussed in the last round, Scenario Seven stood out as satisfying the current parameters, although scenario eight w as the one adopted. Scenario seven does not contain El Toro and constrains LAX to its physical capacity, estimated at 78 MAP.

As a starting point of the analysis, in order to hold to the restrictions of the grant and given the charges given, three variations of scenario seven can be analyzed.

- One would be heavily constrained,
- One moderate expansion variation and
- One high expansion variation.

Mr. Macias then asked the task force for their direction as to whether or not to proceed and reminded the task force of the constraints of keeping SCAG on pace with the overall RTP schedule. Further, the subcontractor contract needs to be finalized in order to proceed, but the starting point is needed.

Councilmember Hal Benson commented that the decision does not need to be made on whether to include or exclude El Toro. The decision is how to cope with the additional demand over the next 30 years. Each country should be responsible for a certain number of passengers and those numbers will be given to the TCC in order to comply with the grant restrictions. All the Task Force can do is make plans. No one has all the answers, so these plans are subject to change as circumstances require. San Diego is being invited to participate in this task force, as they are part of the southern California Region.

Mr. Macias expressed that no decision is required at this point on what to include or exclude, rather what is needed is a recommendation for SCAG staff on what to study so decisions can be made at a later date.

Councilmember Bernson stated that the Task Force is not excluding or including El Toro or expanding LAX, but rather going with the current plan and accepting current realities. Mr. Macias explained that ultimately, the new plan, whatever form it may take, would be compared in the environmental analysis to the old plan, which has El Toro in it.

Hon Mike Gordon, Mayor, City of El Segundo, expressed that he would like to see the methodology and assumptions used to find the totals for the regions at the next meeting. Mr. Macias assured him that could be done.

Hon. Richard Dixon, Mayor, City of Lake Forest, concurred with Mayor Gordon, asked how it would be determined which airport different county residents may go to. Also he asked if a range could be used instead of specific numbers to test the scenarios.

Mr. Hasan Ikhrata, SCAG, explained county boundaries would be used to determine airport preferences for now. Chair Mikels used her county as an example, and stated Mayor Dixon's point will be addressed. Mayor Dixon stated he wanted it placed on the table, as it has not been done to date.

Hon. Ron Roberts, Mayor, City of Temecula, pointed to a study that says SCAG area airports serve about one third of the passengers demand generated by San Diego County. As a result San Diego need to be a part of the process.

Mr. Macias stated he spoke with San Diego and they will give a positive response and would like to appoint one of the members of their new aviation authority. Councilmember Bernson mentioned the Director of Lindbergh Field as a possibility.

Mr. Robert Rodine, VICA, asked to see real estate requirements to support business aviation. Noting that if the task force is to focus solely on passengers and air cargo, then the region will run out of space to service general aviation. General Aviation represents a substantial component of the business community. Mr. Macias stated that could be done.

Mr. Dan Burkhart, National Business Aviation Association, pointed out that business aviation is one of the fastest growing portions of aviation today. Subsequent to 9-11 it has accelerated. Fractional ownership element of business aviation has grown approximately 800 percent in the last 5 years, representing 800 aircraft and 6000 owners. These aircraft will need to land in the region, not just at the major airports but also at the surrounding general aviation airports. This will need to be addressed in the workplan. Mr. Macias explained that staff has discussed this with the Aviation Technical Advisory Committee and it will be addressed. In fact, that information will be part of the modeling that will be done.

Hon. Ruth Galanter, Councilmember, City of Los Angeles, commented on post 9/11 changes in the role of general aviation and a greater interest by passengers to go to smaller regional airports when available. Also, the impact of congestion on the ground, as well as in the air is becoming a serious issue. Mr. Macias answered that is part of the air space methodology.

Mr. Peter Soderquist, Airport Manager, Southern California Logistics Airport inquired as to why the counties are being asked to respond to the projected demand instead of the airport sponsor. Mr. Macias stated the requests were sent to the planning departments for each county, the CTC's and the airports.

Hon. Cathryn De Young, City of Laguna Niguel, stated her support for Scenario Seven, and wanted to make sure the task force was clear on not spending any federal grant money in terms of planning for El Toro. Chair Mikels said all were clear on that and stressed the committee is not about the debate over whether or not there should or should not be an El Toro and thusly will adhere strictly to the restrictions of the federal grant. Chair Mikels pointed out that Mr. Herman Bliss of the FAA is serving on the task force, noting he would make sure of that. Chair Mikels took the opportunity to thank Mr. Bliss, Bill Withycombe and other FAA members in the region for their assistance in navigating the turbulent waters of aviation.

Chair Mikels then put the issue to vote. Councilmember Bernson made the motion to approve the staff recommendation as the starting point for the information to be brought to the Task Force and to adhere to the rules and restrictions of the grant.

Mayor Gordon re-iterated the methodology to be brought to the next meeting. Staff will respond to the questions raised during the meeting.

The vote was by hands for the motion, with no members opposed.

5.2 MagLev Initial Operating Segment

Mr. Tom Palmer, Lockheed Martin, David Chow of IBI Group and Hasan Ikhrata of SCAG gave a similar presentation to that given to the MagLev Task Force on October 16 concerning the initial need for an Initial Operating Segment (IOS). The project has to be framed in an implementable or demonstrable size before the federal government would give any sizable commitment. An another criterion was that the IOS be financially feasible through private financing after the predeployment activity is complete. The third element is that the IOS should be a catalyst for other segments. The MagLev System should complement other existing transportation systems. Mr. Palmer also briefed the task force on the history of the MagLev planning process.

Mr. Hasan Ikhrata, Interim Director of Planning and Policy at SCAG reminded the Task Force members of some of the actions taken by the Regional Council when adopting the 2001 Transportation Plan. The plan had a MagLev system designed to move commuters and link airports to enhance the decentralization of airports in the region. These were the goals of the MagLev system and are also why the Aviation Task Force was asked to make its recommendations to the TCC concerning which MagLev segment or segments can enhance the decentralization strategy. There are four corridors and over 30 segments, each of which has pros and cons. Since the adoption of the 2001 plan, El Toro has been removed from consideration, so Orange County passengers will need to use alternate airports and that will need to be considered by the Task Force.

Mr. David Chow, IBI Group detailed to the Task Force the various segments within each corridor, indicating which ranked favorably. Mr. Chow emphasized that the entire MagLev system is very comprehensive, with over four corridors, and implementing even one corridor all at once, would be difficult. Therefore the IOS should be self-supporting and the corridor/system should expand from there.

Four corridors are being considered, three of which have already been studied by SCAG:

- LAX to March
- LAX to Palmdale
- LAX South (El Segundo area to Irvine Area)
- Anaheim to Corona to Ontario, with a future extension to Las Vegas (being proposed by California Nevada MagLev Group)

Mr. Chow reviewed the methodology by which each corridor and segment was evaluated. For each corridor, RTP performance measures were used. For each segment, various characteristics were examined, such as if they had airport connections, how expensive they would be to build and maintain, etc to determine if the segments are financially feasible.

Mr. Chow talked briefly about the RTP performance measures, such as mobility, cost effectiveness, accessibility, environmental justice and equity and the reliability and thusly ranked the corridors.

They further looked at the characteristics of the segments to see what the segments consist of to find out travel times, direct airport connections etc. They also looked at the availability of information and plan on building on previous work. They also considered revenue and revenue cost ratio.

For each of the corridors they identified how they performed relative to each other and ranked the corridors based on that information. Mr. Chow then stated that except for LAX/March and LAX Palmdale all the corridors ranked high across the board, while LAX/South and LAX/Ontario didn't rank as high relative to the first two, but are still worthy of consideration.

Mr. Chow then turned to the focus characteristics, in particular the revenue to cost ratio. Looking at both the corridor level and the segment level, the ratio gives an indication of how quickly the systems can pay for themselves. The top ranked corridor LAX/March with a ratio of 7.32 or a 21-year payout period, with LAX/Palmdale being the second ranked corridor.

Within the corridors the top ranking segment is LAX/West LA/Union Station with a payout period of 25 years. Mr. Chow then explained station access and the cost of the system would affect why the corridor will pay for itself before the segment. While you can capture more people by extending out, it also costs more as you extend out.

Mr. Chow explained how the revenue cost ratio works, anything above 5 is considered to meet the financial feasibility standard that has been established for MagLev. He says this is just a measure of how these segments perform relative to each other, and is not financial analysis of investment quality rigor. A ranking between three and four is still worthy but represents some risk from the financial perspective.

Mr. Chow then turned to Mr. Tom Palmer to talk about the constructability of MagLev.

Mr. Palmer spoke briefly of the challenges of the IOS's but said that all of them are constructable. He also mentioned they did not evaluate a right of way release risk, as they did not have a chance to talk to the ownership elements associated with the ridership.

Mr. Palmer then talked about recommendations made by the MagLev Task Force, specifically two corridors, first segment 32 the LAX/March corridor and segment 28, the Union Station/Anaheim line.

Mr. Ikhrata, SCAG, then concluded the presentation and asked the board to make a recommendation to the TTC and RC on the subject.

A question was asked about the feasibility and whether they took into consideration population grow th and the availability of air travel from the locations being dealt with, to which Mr. Ikhrata answered that those factors were taken into account. The questioner then asked how it was anticipated that the project would be funded, to which Mr. Ikhrata replied the only public contribution in the analysis is the right of way and the environmental studies, everything else would be funded with revenue bonds.

It was then mentioned that the new demographics would need to be incorporated into the data, especially in relation to El Toro because the demographics still use El Toro as an airport.

After some debate and various technical questions about MagLev, Chair Mikels reminded the board their mission is to look at MagLev and select a recommendation not to debate pros and cons of MagLev.

Hon. Mike Gordon, City of El Segundo, asked whether ridership info would be available on the web. Mayor Gordon stated he was going to support the recommendation with a couple of caveats.

- That any operation system that goes forward needs to include Ontario. Inland Empire airports are critical to an aviation system in southern California working, and as Ontario is the hub of that opportunity it would be a mistake to recommend any initial segment that did not include Ontario.
- Second, the initial operating systems should not include LAX as it would result in east-west movement.
- Third, LAX should not be included until Ontario has been given full opportunity to develop, so LAX is not in competition with Ontario.

Hon. Ron Roberts, Mayor, City of Temecula, asked why two recommendations are being brought before the committee and also why MagLev is being considered for a slow speed segment.

Hon. Ron Bates, Mayor, City of Los Alamitos, answered that MagLev is the most environmentally sensitive technology. Although it operates at a lower speed it may be the only environmentally acceptable technology to work in that corridor. Further it proves at lower speeds to still be cost effective. He then further explained the two recommendations were in line with the direction of the RC

Mr. Robert Rodine, VICA, asked about the origin of LAX on the Palmdale and Orange County links and the volume at LAX as the train will go both ways. Mr. Rodine wanted to know if extra parking would be available.

Mr. Ikhrata stated the origins and destinations were chosen based on getting the best ridership and having a system that will be able to pay for itself. He also noted that the aviation scenario adopted limited LAX to 78 million annual passengers and keeping LAX at that number it wouldn't matter how they get people to outlying airports. He also stated the MagLev task force did consider the additional parking that is need for each station and it was incorporated into the cost.

Mr. Bruce Nestande, Los Angeles Business Advisors expressed his concern over airport capacity, namely whether high speed rail will have an effect on the projected growth in airport capacity. He also expressed concern over whether the MagLev system could be in operation by 2009.

Mr. Ikhrata answered the system will redistribute people to outlying airports, but is not proposed as a solution to the growth in airport capacity.

Mr. Tom Palmer stated he would be willing to discuss the technical details of constructing the MagLev with Mr. Nestande after the meeting when there is more time.

Chair Mikels asked the committee to keep in mind their concern is to make a recommendation as to what should be the initial operating system. The Chair suggested another meeting with only a technical briefing if there was enough interest. Chair Mikels emphasized that the Task Force is not to debate the pros and cons of MagLev. It is not the decision of the task force, but rather the MagLev Task Force. The Aviation Task Force is only to make a recommendation as to what should be the initial operating segment.

Hon Dick Stanford, City of Azusa, then made the point that it hasn't been decided that El Toro is dead, also Airbus service at Ontario would make the leg that includes Ontario very viable. Third, Mayor Stanford supported the earlier comment that LAX should not be part of the Initial Operating Segment.

Hon. Cathryn De Young, City of Laguna Niguel, asked if all corridors end up at the airports. Mr. Chow explained that all four corridors have terminal stations.

Hon. Cindy Miscikowski, City of Los Angeles, asked about the integration of MagLev with other systems and if there is right away would that compete with light rail. She also asked what percentage of airport passengers and non-airport passengers. Mr. Ikhrata stated MagLev does not compete with any light rail

systems. He further stated this system would enhance the ridership of other systems. Also he explained that the majority of the trips would be commuter trips, while airport trips are a significant portion, for example LAX/March around 25% of the trips would be airport trips, the rest would be commuter trips.

Mr. Russell Hammer, Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, asked how line 32 would look without LAX. Mr. Ikhrata stated it would impact the line and probably low er the ridership to not include LAX.

Mr. Palmer then made a comment on a possible line from Ontario to West LA without connecting into LAX, and in that context it has a 3.6 revenue to cost ratio which has some risk associated with it. If Union Station to Ontario is added to that certain business relationships would have to be developed to make sure it is a very profitable line structure. Ridership wise it is being looked at but Mr. Palmer thinks it will be a good line, not excellent, but good.

Mr. James De La Loza asked about if the Union Station to LAX uses the harbor substation. Mr. Ikhrata stated there were three options connecting LAX to Union Station and one used the Harbor substation. Mr. De La Loza asked if there would be a risk assessment if ridership or revenues don't pan out, and what those impacts might be. Mr. Ikhrata answered that risk assessment analysis has been done.

Mr. Milford Harrison, San Bernardino International Airport asked if San Bernardino International Airport was left out of segment 32. Mr. Ikhrata assured Mr. Harrison there would be a station at San Bernardino Airport.

Mr. Ted Stein, Los Angeles City Airport Commission, stated that if the fifth LAX alternative is designed to hold LAX to 78 million annual passengers, questioned why should the Initial Operating Segment include LAX instead of concentrating on sending passengers from Union Station to Ontario in order to meet demand there. Mr. Ikhrata stated all the segments involving LAX did very well from a performance standpoint.

Hon. Hal Bernson, City of Los Angeles, stated that whatever route is selected, it must be something that will enhance areas that are building. There already is capacity in some areas, there are some areas that don't want to develop anything, but the system should service both commuters and airports to account for the 5-6 million additional residents that will call this region home in the next 20-30 years. If this system is going to work, it must be part of the comprehensive transportation plan.

Hon. Stacey Murphy, City of Burbank, noted that the first segment should use the highest and best technology, and that perhaps the first segment should

show case the high speed. Mr. Ikhrata noted that an average speed of 55 miles per hour is much better than the traditional urban rail system with an average speed of 15-20 miles per hour.

Hon. Gary Ovitt, City of Ontario noted that the Ontario is a viable airport and whatever segment is chosen, the Ontario airport should be part of it. Also, Mayor Ovitt questioned whether an Ontario to Anaheim leg would be funded via some other method, as it wasn't studied by SCAG. Mr. Palmer of Lockheed Martin stated that Nevada would build its line and the southern California line would receive predeployment dollars. Mr. Palmer assumed that whatever line is chosen for an IOS, the Anaheim to Ontario line should be part of the deliberative process.

Hon. Ron Bates, City of Los Alamitos, noted that the critical element for this MagLev system is that the initial operating segment must perform very well, for it will form the basis for expanding the system. An entire segment is probably needed to be financially feasible, how ever, w hatever segment is built, w hich end is where the system starts construction is negotiable. Another issue to be considered is ground access to the extent that ground access constraints are relieved.

Mr. Peter Soderquist, Southern California Logistics Airport, questioned whether a MagLev connection to LAX might increase demand at LAX by making it easier to access the airport. Mr. Hasan Ikhrata noted the commuter market is the main market. In addition, LAX was considered physically constrained to 78 million passengers, so it would be difficult to increase capacity at LAX through MagLev.

Hon. Tod Ridgeway, Mayor, City of Newport Beach expressed his agreement with Mayor Gordon's recommendations.

Hon. Mike Gordon, Mayor, City of El Segundo, made the motion to "Accept the recommendation of the MagLev Task Force, with the following conditions: 1) that the initial operating segment must include Ontario Airport, 2) that the initial operating segment will not include LAX, and 3) that MagLev will not go to LAX until at which time we have completed and are implementing the Ontario segment."

[Unidentified task force member] "Seconded."

[NOTE: Discussion related to the motion is detailed verbatim]

Chair Mikels: "I am going to use the power of the gavel because I have been relatively quiet. I do not support the final statement. It is not this committee's job to go to 'nothing will happen until.' We're asked for the initial operating segment, so I think it's very valid, your first one, and I'm quite frankly in support of it. But I would prefer that the Task Force understand our parameters as well and I think that final

statement goes farther than we really should go in a recommendation. Now, whatever this group supports, that's fine, but I wanted to make that comment. I don't want us to get into the purview of the Maglev Task Force. All we were asked is what should the initial operating segment be. So I would like to keep us to that Mike. But, it's up to you."

Mayor Gordon: "Before I change the motion, what I would like to do is hear the comments of the committee."

Chair Mikels: "Absolutely, When I do this and make comments, I am only one person. There you go. Hal?"

Councilmember Hal Bernson, City of Los Angeles, "I don't have any problem with that except for the finalization. I think that belongs with the Regional Council. We don't what time will do. I understand where you are coming from on it. I would like to include a friendly amendment to that. I think we ought to include, ought to run West Los Angeles, Union Station, Ontario for the first segment, and I would offer that as a friendly amendment.

Mayor Gordon: "That would be acceptable."

Chair Mikels: "Does the second accept the amendment?"

[Unidentified task force member]: "Yes."

Chair Mikels: Next I had Harrison and then Ruth, Mr. Harrison and then Ruth.

Milford Harrison: Thank You. I just wanted to make sure I understood what the motion was recommending. Is it number 32? Is it just the initial segment? What is your motion sir?

Mayor Gordon: It is the initial operating segment that we are discussing...

Hasan Ikhrata, SCAG Staff: It is Number 32 that we are discussing. It is the LAX to March, and the conditions that you listed, correct?

Mayor Gordon: Right.

Milford Harrison: That is the one that excludes San Bernardino.

Hasan Ikhrata: No no that includes San Bernardino Sir [laughter]

Mayor Ron Bates. City of Los Alamitos: Madam Chair, under debate...

Milford Harrison: Could you include that in your motion, because San Bernardino is not on here

Mayor Gordon: Absolutely, in big block letters.

Milford Harrison: Thank you very much.

Chair Mikels: Okay. Does that second go along with that?

[Unidentified Task Force Member] Yes

Chair Mikels: EK, Next I had Ruth, then I will get to Ron.

Councilmember Ruth Galanter, City of Los Angeles: Thank You Judy. I just wanted to respond to your comments. I think procedurally, you are probably correct, but so I am comfortable amending the motion as we just did, but I, I think that it is helpful for the Maglev Task Force and the Regional Council to have the benefit of some of the thinking that goes into why these motions came out the way they did, and Mike's summary of it in that third statement, actually compressed a whole long discussion that really deals with what a number of people here have already mentioned.

Chair Mikels: And I agree with you Ruth except that I think we're not there yet as far as going beyond the initial operating segment because this group has just seen it today.

Councilmember Galanter: OK, I am not fighting over that, I guess I have a procedural question. Is there some way to incorporate in our discussion, in our minutes, so that it is available for whoever else from SCAG is going to be voting on this, the fact that that was part of our thinking?

Chair Mikels: I would hope that all of our minutes would go forward to Maglev, TCC, and eventually the RC. Ron?

Mayor Ron Bates. City of Los Alamitos: Under debate, I'm not, I don't think disagreeing with Mike's intent. I'm disagreeing not so much with number three, but disagreeing with number two. Because all I'm suggesting to you is that without LAX in there, when it gets to pricing this out and deciding whether the finance community will support it, chances are very good they will not. Now, you know, we're going to say it will go from maybe a number 4 rating to a number 3.4 rating, which is good, but it's not a 5 rating which is really what we need to get this system going, so we [interruption] let me finish, let me finish under debate. So my point would be, is, I think if we go from Ontario all the way to LAX, and go along with the logic that Mike had stated for number three, you start the construction of

that system at Ontario, but yet you can price the whole line, and that is ultimately what goes to the market. That gives us the highest probability of financial success, so I think we are trying to get to the same place. Further I would argue, that by starting in Ontario, you have a lot of the other opportunities that have been indicated by Gary in terms of potential connections through there and ultimately, then, also from there out to connecting the other airports out in San Bernardino and March. So I think there are a lot more potential, by starting at that end of the line, rather than I think Hal has indicated, but isn't a bad idea too, starting in West LA too. I am just suggesting that Ontario, from a practical point of view makes a little more sense.

Chair Mikels: Ok just a minute. Hasan, do you have something technical to...?

Hasan Ikhrata: I just wanted to make sure everybody knows what Mayor Gordon is choosing is Corridor 32. LAX to March, including San Bernardino, and he is saying the condition of starting construction at Ontario. So LAX is still in the corridor.

Chair Mikels: No he, I am sorry Hasan, he took LAX out.

Mr. Ted Stein, Los Angeles City Airport Commission: Ron, my question to you is, I mean, I walk into a meeting and I am given a document I don't even have an opportunity to read it first. Now we are getting into the financing more so because of the revenue bonds. Shouldn't we have the answer to your question before we vote on this to see whether or not by taking LAX out of it, whether it will have the detrimental effect, because I am not convinced it will. It just seems premature to vote on something without having the bond community come back to us.

Chair Mikels: OK, I have Hal next and then Rusty.

Mr. Russell Hammer, Los Angels Area Chamber of Commerce: Well that is the point I tried to make in the question I was trying to ask earlier. We have your evaluation criteria based on certain assumptions that you made. But if we're going to change those, if we're going to change those assumptions, if we're going to change these routes, then we ought to know what the impact of that change is before we take an action to make a recommendation. I think it would be irresponsible to do that.

[Unidentified] I thought, he answered my question saying he had...

Mayor Bates: No they are working on it. They haven't finished it, yet

Chair Mikels: OK, Next I have Hal

Councilmember Hal Bernson: First of all, let me just say that we're talking about an initial phase now. That is all. I think it would be ludicrous to think that we will not have to have some kind of connection at some point in the future between Union Station and LAX, which makes the most sense, whether it's Magley, or whether its some other form, that is something that is going to have to be, not to bring more passengers, but to facilitate the passengers to get there. Now, I don't know how much sense it makes frankly, to move people from one airport to another airport. That doesn't seem to me to be the most efficient or well-planned thing. I think you need to move people from airports to other transportation centers, such as Union Station, or whatever the case may be. So, I don't think we ought to get bogged down now in a debate about. [Unintelligible] because someway, LAX is going to have to have a connection to Union Station whether its Maglev or something, we don't need to deal with that today. We need to deal with the most potential expansion area that we have for future aviation and that happens to be Ontario. So that's why it makes the sense. And it also will connect with San Bernardino. we don't want to leave you out, and Riverside. The point is that is the route that makes sense. Now, ultimately in order to facilitate people using other airports, or ultimately LAX for people within west Los Angeles, Santa Monica or the beach areas, a length from West Los Angeles to Union Station to Ontario. That's why I suggested that as an amendment to that. But we don't need to fight the battle of LAX today, or the battle of El Toro. That's one of the things we want to avoid in this task force. We will make allocations of what people are responsible for, and what they need to plan for, within their own counties when it comes to that. But we need to just, to meet the deadlines for federal funding and for other things that we need. For the Maglev initiative, we need to have this decided by December. It has to go from here to the TCC to the Regional Council and ultimately to Washington. So I think we only need to deal with the initial starting portion today and that is why I think the motion on 32 is a good motion and I think we need to adopt it.

Chair Mikels" OK, further debate or questions?

[Unidentified] Call for the question

Chair Mikels: You're calling for the question. Ok [interruption] A call for the question. Just a moment, there is a call for the question. How many people support calling the question. You have to vote on that first. [Show of hands indicated to proceed] OK I have a majority, I think. Could we please restate the motion, with the amendments, friendly amendments that were accepted by the Second?

Mayor Gordon: All right, we are going to accept the Recommendation of the Maglev Task Force with the following additions...

Councilmember Bernson: For Route 32

Mayor Gordon: for Route 32. The Initial Operating Segment will include Ontario and with the friendly amendment that it would be from West Los Angeles, to Union Station, to Ontario...

[Unidentified] and San Bernardino...

Mayor Gordon: and San Bernardino...

Councilmember Bernson: That's Route 32

[Unidentified] But that eliminates LAX, right?

Chair Mikels: For know, but keep in mind and this is hard, but time is a constraint, TEA-3 and all of the other issues that are coming up, we don't have a long time to bring this task force all the way to the end with Maglev. And I apologize for that, but I felt as chair that it is critical that this group since we are working with passenger and cargo demand, that we at least had some sort of a recommendation and that the first, that initial operating segment was not just strictly a commuter only segment which would not help enforce our plan of moving demand to where demand is desired, i.e. San Bernardino.

[End of tape 1, beginning of tape 2]

Mayor Gordon: I just wanted to be clear on one point, that with Hal's amendment that has been accepted, that item number two, which is the initial operating segment will not include LAX, is clear to everyone.

Councilmember Bernson: It's not in there.

[Unintelligible discussion]

Chair Mikels: Okay, don't argue. Debate is closed, Because we have a vote on the question. So we are calling the question. All those in favor...

[Unidentified task force members] I don't understand the question. Is LAX in or out?

Councilmember Bernson: It's not in

Chair Mikels: OK. Read the motion one more time.

Mayor Gordon: We're accepting the Maglev Task Force, in that the initial operating segment will, number 32, will be from west LA to Union Station to Ontario. LAX is not to be included...

Milford Harrison: San Bernardino

Chair Mikels: In the initial

Mayor Gordon: San Bernardino is part of number 32.

Councilmember Bernson: That wasn't part of the motion

Chair Mikels: Yes it is. That was his motion. But we are talking the initial operating

segment. LAX is not to be included under that motion

Councilmember Bernson: Is not in the initial operating segment

Chair Mikels: In the initial operating segment. Not that it is not in 32. The condition is

that that not be in the initial operating segment. Are we all clear on that?

Mayor Gordon: Yes

Mayor Bates; We don't have the information to vote on it, but I am clear on it.

Chair Mikels: Ron, you certainly have the information. You've been doing this for four years. OK. Now this is a recommendation from our group. It will be going to the people that have been doing this for a long time. They may not accept our recommendations. But it's important that the task force say that aviation ought to be included as one of the indicators for the initial operating segment, and that's all we're being asked to do. So by saying that it has to include Ontario (San Bernardino), that we are saying as a task force to help us meet our needs of managing passenger demand in the future, without \boxminus Toro at this present time. That the Airport destination is critical to that first or initial operating segment. That is what we are being asked to do.

Councilmember Galanter: Point of clarification. When I asked earlier, that, this, Ron is saying, or maybe Rusty said it, but, when I asked earlier if they had looked at the full routes by segments and had the financial payback information, I was told that they did, so they have that information.

Mayor Bates: Not for all of them. Not for the combination that we are being asked to vote on.

Chair Mikels: That is not necessarily important for us because if it doesn't work out, the Maglev, we are not taking a vote on [interruption]

Councilmember Galanter: They told me they did have it, now you are telling me they don't have it.

Chair Mikels: Ruth, Excuse me

Councilmember Galanter: I'm trying to know what I am voting on.

Councilmember Bernson: We're merely making a recommendation to TCC.

Chair Mikels: We're only making a recommendation that if is financially feasible, if we can get the bonding and the funding, if we can get the environmentals done, and we can get the right of way, this is our recommendation. Did that cover everything?

Chair Mikels: OK. All in favor of the motion, and if you don't wish to vote, don't, but here we go. All in favor of the motion on the floor, please raise your hand.

[Show of hands]

Chair Mikels: All opposed

[Show of hands]

Chair Mikels: It obviously carries. OK. Now. This is the fun part of this committee. Of all these lovely debates, and having industry here and having airports here, because this is what we struggle with on a daily basis. So we have a lot of work to do.

Chair Mikels asked the committee if any members would want to have a separate meeting to discuss to get information on MagLev, the segments and airports and how to meet that demand. It was indicated that it would be beneficial, and a separate "offline" meeting would be scheduled.

The Task Force returned to Agenda Item 5.1.

6.0 <u>SET NEXT MEETING DATE/TIME/PLACE</u>

Chair Judy Mikels stated that the schedule calls for the third Thursday of every month. The next meeting will be held on November 21 at the SCAG offices at 10:00 a.m.

7.0 <u>A DJOURNMENT</u>

Chairperson Judy Mikels adjourned the meeting at 12:08 pm.